

Golden Gate University School of Law GGU Law Digital Commons

GGU Law Review Blog

Student Scholarship

10-3-2013

Sex Trafficking in Massage Parlors: Working Out the Knots in the San Francisco Health Code

Joanne Badua

Golden Gate University School of Law, lawreview@ggu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/ggu_law_review_blog



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Health Law and Policy Commons](#), and the [Law and Gender Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Badua, Joanne, "Sex Trafficking in Massage Parlors: Working Out the Knots in the San Francisco Health Code" (2013). *GGU Law Review Blog*. Paper 16.

http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/ggu_law_review_blog/16

This Blog Post is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at GGU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in GGU Law Review Blog by an authorized administrator of GGU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact jfischer@ggu.edu.



Sex Trafficking in Massage Parlors: Working Out the Knots in the San Francisco Health Code

OCTOBER 3, 2013 BY [JOANNE BADUA](#) 1 COMMENT

Brothels masquerading as massage parlors flourish in San Francisco, which is a notorious [hub](#) for sex trafficking. In the Sunset District alone, Supervisor Katy Tang's office found [at least thirty massage businesses](#), some of which blatantly offer "happy endings." The Tenderloin and parts of Chinatown are also teeming with spas that provide such alternative services. Human traffickers hide behind these business fronts, selling sex. The situation in San Francisco is so dire that laws on the local level must be retooled to advance regulation that stops human trafficking.

[Behind the closed doors](#) of these massage parlors, traffickers force their victims to live on-site to service men seven days a week. Mostly women and girls, these victims often lack support systems and are ignorant of their legal rights. Many are also undocumented and struggle with language barriers. Traffickers thrive on these vulnerabilities, using force, fraud, or coercion to enslave sex workers.

District 4 Supervisor [Katy Tang](#) recognizes that the city's ambiguous laws enable this exploitation. On July 31, 2013, Tang [proposed amendments](#) to Article 29 of the San Francisco Health Code ("the Code"), which provides for the licensing and regulation of massage practitioners. Pursuant to the Code, the city's Department of Public Health ("the Department") issues permits to allow massage establishments to operate. It is also responsible for enforcing the Code, which purports to protect the health and safety of customers and employees. However, the Code doesn't provide these protections.

First, the Code avoids the "knotty" issue of sex by not specifying that it is prohibited. While it does prohibit "[illegal conduct](#)," it does not explicitly ban "sex" or activities that are sexual in nature. Although "illegal conduct" includes prostitution, this phrase is inadequate to protect workers or patrons seeking massage services. Explicitly prohibiting sexual conduct would make it clear that sex services shouldn't be provided in massage parlors.

Tang's proposed legislation would amend the code by unambiguously prohibiting sexual activity, as well as drug and alcohol use. The amendment would result in a cleaner and safer establishment for patrons looking for a legitimate massage, furthering the purposes of the Code and taking a step toward ending human trafficking.

Another flaw in the current Code is the obscurity of its enforcement provisions. The penalties for parlor owners who violate provisions of Article 29 include permit suspension, permit revocation, and fines. Section 1928 provides a general outline of how these fines are to be assessed, but its over-simplification is a problem. It doesn't provide enough guidance regarding how to punish owners based on the severity of their violations. Furthermore, parlor owners can overcome license revocation by re-applying in five years. As long as an owner has the money to pay for penalties and re-application fees, he or she can skirt the rules by opening another sex parlor under a new name.

Tang's proposed legislation addresses these problems by providing more detailed penalty guidelines. For example, if an owner were to allow sex acts in his or her parlor, the owner would face an administrative fine of \$1,000 and a 60-day permit suspension. A repeat violation would result in permit revocation for the massage parlor and the masseuse. More importantly, an owner convicted of a human trafficking charge would become ineligible to apply for a new massage establishment permit.

Another pragmatic change proposed by Tang is to require masseuses to carry their massage license identification cards at all times. This practical fix would address the

Search

Recent Posts

- A CC-Pain: Abuse of C.C.P. § 170.6
Peremptory Challenges
- Employee Rights: If Nobody Knows,
Who Cares?
- Space Rock Mining: A Land Rush Without Title
- Remove Time Limits on Reunification; Choose
Guardianship over Adoption
- It's Still Perilous to Catch a Lyft in
San Francisco

Archives

- March 2014
- February 2014
- January 2014
- November 2013
- October 2013
- April 2013
- March 2013
- February 2013
- January 2013
- October 2012

Categories

- GGU Law Review
- Ninth Circuit

Authors

Department’s lack of resources to oversee enforcement of the Code’s provisions and would result in more efficient investigations. Furthermore, this requirement would communicate to patrons that the establishment is a legitimate massage parlor and not for adult entertainment.

The Code’s provisions must be revised to reflect San Francisco’s stance on human trafficking, which is that these businesses cannot thrive on the backs of the sexually exploited. The [San Francisco Collaborative against Human Trafficking](#) (“SFCaHT”) has expressed the city’s vision for a community that fully appreciates “the value of each human life and abhors any practice that denies a person her or his right to live a life free from violence, exploitation, or slavery.” One of SFCaHT’s goals is to turn these values into reality by advocating for policy changes. Supervisor Tang’s proposed amendment to Article 29 of the Health Code does precisely that.

Share this:

Email

Twitter 1

Facebook 41

LinkedIn 1

Google+

Reblog

Like

One blogger likes this.

Related

Sex Offender Residency Restrictions Serve No Purpose
In "GGU Law Review"

Hollingsworth v. Perry: United States Supreme Court Grants Certiorari to Hear the 'Prop 8' Case
In "GGU Law Review"

It's Still Perilous to Catch a Lyft in San Francisco
In "GGU Law Review"

GGU Law Review

human trafficking, Katy Tang, legislature, massage parlors, masseuse, san francisco, sex trafficking, sex workers

About Joanne Badua

J.D. Candidate, 2014, Golden Gate University School of Law
[View all posts by Joanne Badua →](#)

[Lying in the Sun](#)

[Sex Offender Residency Restrictions Serve No Purpose](#)

One Response to “Sex Trafficking in Massage Parlors: Working Out the Knots in the San Francisco Health Code”

kristinamaalouf

October 22, 2013 at 12:22 pm

Reply

Great article, Joanne. Thank you for your attention to this important and timely issue. San Francisco is loved by its residents for being a laid-back city, but it’s important that law enforcement doesn’t get too lax about monitoring human rights violations.

Leave a Reply

Enter your comment here...

- Andy Brunner-Brown
- cassieheuckroth
- erikfaussner
- Mark Wilson
- Executive Online Editor
- Joanne Badua
- jefftye
- Kristina Maalouf
- Laura Patty
- Mark Heisey
- Richard Miyasaki
- Stephen Butts
- Lee Howery

Like us on Facebook



Golden Gate University Law Review



You like this.

Follow us on Twitter

Tweets

Follow



GGU Law Review
@GGULawReview

24 Mar

A CC-Pain: Abuse of C.C.P. § 170.6 Peremptory Challenges
[wp.me/p2rEUu-6V](#) via [@GGULawReview](#)